University of New Brunswick
in Saint John

Ward Chipman Library

WITHDRAWN
DAMAGED
MISSING (INV.)
OTHER

Governors General Collection

presented by
H.M.S. Hood Chapter, I.O.D.E.

335.204.L30
making of a nation :
UNIVERSITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK LIBRARIES
3 9960 00093222 8

THE MAKING OF A NATION

A LECTURE AT MILTON ACADEMY

ON THE

ALUMNI WAR MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

NOVEMBER 30, 1927

THE MAKING OF A NATION

BY

VINCENT MASSEY

Minister of Canada to the United States

BOSTON AND NEW YORK

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY

The Riverside Press Cambridge

1928

WITHDRAWN

☐ DESELECTED

☐ LOST

☐ DAMAGED

☐ MISSING (INV.)

☐ OTHER

GOVERNORS GENERAL
COLLECTION
335
.204
L30

COPYRIGHT, 1928, BY THE TRUSTEES OF MILTON ACADEMY
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE · MASSACHUSETTS
PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PREFACE

UNDER the title 'How Canada became a Nation,' this lecture was given at Milton in November, 1927, after the customary series of informal conferences which the Foundation ordains. The questions asked in the conferences gave evidence of the keen interest felt by the rising generation of Americans in upholding the splendid tradition of friendship between Canada and the United States. Mr. Massey's answers made that interest keener still. His address made so clear the evolution of a nationality which can strengthen old ties in the exercise of new liberties that his hearers caught a fresh vision of a neighborhood of nations, between which 'frontiers' shall fade away, and only 'international lines' remain.

W. L. W. FIELD

MILTON ACADEMY
February 19, 1928

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/maakingofnation0000vinc

THE ALUMNI WAR MEMORIAL FOUNDATION

At Milton Academy

STATEMENT OF THE PLAN

Adopted March 7, 1922

There has been established at Milton Academy, in memory of the twenty-two alumni of the School who gave their lives in the World War, a permanent Foundation for lectures and informal conferences dealing with the responsibilities and opportunities attaching to leadership in a democracy. It is intended that the lectures shall be given and the conferences shall be led by men of preëminent ability and attainment in various fields of political or commercial administration or professional work, and that the Foundation shall provide an income adequate to the payment of appropriate stipends to such men, and for the publication in suitable form of the lectures delivered whenever such publication shall be authorized by the Head Master and the Executive Committee.

It is further provided that the names of the men commemorated shall be recorded on a tablet to be placed in the Chapel at Milton Academy, and that this tablet shall bear a symbolic device in bas relief, expressive of the spirit of the memorial and adapted for reproduction in miniature on all books and documents in which the further development of the memorial shall from time to time find expression.

Such a memorial as this will never grow old or wear out or be forgotten. Its full strength may be applied over and over again through the years to come to the solution of problems like those which led our country into the war, and to whose solution the men we commemorate intended their sacrifices to contribute.

THE MAKING OF A NATION

THE MAKING OF A NATION

IT is a great honour to be with you here and I am deeply conscious of the privilege which you have given me. There is nothing that can make quite the same appeal as a great school — one that has preserved that indefinable thing called tradition. You have a fine tradition here in Milton — carried on now for one century and a quarter. But you do more than maintain your old customs. You are creating new ones, and this Foundation under which I come to you to-night, established by way of tribute to those Miltonians who laid down their lives in the Great War, is a new tradition in the making.

What a wise memorial it is! I am happy to participate in it — grateful for what I have learned from you in the last two days. We cannot more fittingly honour the dead

than by quickening our own minds and hearts — we that survive them — by recalling that challenge pictured on your beautiful memorial tablet with its words 'The cause shall not fail.' Our Canadian soldier-poet put the same thought in the mouths of the dead in battle when he wrote:

> 'To you from failing hands we throw
> The torch; be yours to hold it high.
> If ye break faith with us who die,
> We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
> In Flanders fields.'

I am glad to be with you to help do honour to those sons of Milton who did not return from the War. I count it a high privilege to be the unworthy successor of the distinguished men who have already visited Milton upon this Foundation.

As to my choice of subject this evening, I ask you to be charitable. You may, however, count it as not unnatural that a Canadian Minister should wish to talk to you

about Canada. I do not propose to inflict upon you a lecture on Canadian economics, or geography, or even on Canadian history. What I want to do — not, I hope, at too great length — is to give you some idea of how Canada grew from a few scattered hamlets of French and English settlers in the primitive 'bush' into that something which we call a nation.

A nation, of course, is hard to define. But perhaps it is not worth while to trouble about definitions. You who live here as citizens of your own great country know without juggling with words what it means. You have a pride in your nation's past, belief in its present, and confidence in its future. You are prepared — and this is the real test — to make sacrifices for it. Your nationality is a thing big enough to inspire devotion on the part of the individual and to demand co-operation on the part of the community. We in Canada have developed over the years

our own spirit of nationality. It is of this that I want to talk to you.

You are now passing through a period in the history of your country when you are celebrating the anniversaries of the great events, the battles and historic meetings, that mark its beginning one hundred and fifty years ago. It happens that Canada, that is to say Canada as a British country, has also just a little more than a century and a half behind it. The history of the United States as an independent country dates from 1776. Civil government under the British flag in Canada commenced just a few years before this. To-day finds us neighbouring nations, but the road we have travelled has been strikingly different. The years 1776, 1783, and 1789 mark the rapid steps by which you achieved, almost in a single bound, complete sovereignty. Our nationhood was developed in slow, measured stages extending over a century and a half. You

put an end to the political structure which we may call the first British Empire. With the lessons of history in mind, it has been possible for Canada, in working out its own destiny under the British Crown, to take its part in laying the foundations of a new British Empire on true and enduring lines.

The old Empire, with its colonies governed by one Parliament in Great Britain, was built on a simple system. It was strictly logical, but like so many logical things it failed. The new Empire to which we belong has preserved many of the forms of the old, but the spirit has changed. It is no longer represented by a 'Mother Country' with 'infant colonies' round her knee. Nor is it even suggested by a mother with grown-up daughters. The picture now is that of a group of partners — Great Britain and the Dominions — members of a sisterhood of nations. Through the years there has been created, by the countless acts of statesmen in Great

Britain and overseas, that which has come to be called a Dominion. The old-fashioned historian, if you told him that a state existed which was entirely free, and yet not independent, which owed allegiance to a King across the water, and yet possessed complete self-government, would say, like the countryman who saw his first giraffe, 'There ain't no such animal'; and yet such a state is a fact — just as much a fact as a monarchy or a republic. And it was in Canada that this strange new thing called a Dominion was developed, not because any group of men sat down and said to each other, 'Let's start something new,' but because, over a period of a century and a half, a community, beyond your northern boundary, steadily widened the range of self-government as necessity arose and practical problems had to be faced and solved.

You will know from your own history books some of the main points in our story. I shall not talk of the heroic age of the ex-

plorers. That is a golden tale in itself. The voyages of the first discoverers, Cartier, Champlain, and La Salle, and the men they inspired; La Vérendrye and his sons discovering the prairies and spending twenty years in that gallant search for the Western Sea which was brought to an end by the mountains which they found across their path; Sir Alexander Mackenzie, who fifty years after daubed a proud legend on a rock on the Pacific shore — 'From Canada [and that meant from Montreal], by land, 1793.' And then there were the splendid failures like that of Sir John Franklin which thrill us just as much as success. We Canadians have a warm place in our hearts for this race of adventurers. We are still hearing that call of which Kipling tells — the 'voice as bad as conscience' which says to us:

'Something hidden. Go and find it. Go and look behind the Ranges —
Something lost behind the Ranges. Lost and waiting for you. Go!'

In our great, vast country we are still exploring, not now through lake and over portage only, but by aeroplane as well, to find terminals for new railways that are nosing their way through the wilderness, and harbours for ships that have still to be built, and to make surveys for the homes of unborn Canadians.

Let me begin my sketch in 1759. In that year, you will recall, a great Englishman, Wolfe, met in battle a great Frenchman, Montcalm, in the fields near Quebec, and in a short and gallant fight replaced the lilies of France with the Union Jack of Britain. This battle between French and English was fought with the chivalry of a gentlemen's duel. Whenever you visit Quebec, if you look for the monument of Wolfe and Montcalm, you will find inscribed on its base one of the most stirring and fitting inscriptions ever chiselled in stone:

'*Mortem virtus communem, famam historia, monumentum posteritas dedit.*'
'Valour gave them a common death, history a common fame, posterity a common monument.

What was to be done by Great Britain with its newly won possession? In those days the conqueror as a rule was none too nice in his care for the feelings of the conquered. But wisdom and justice finally prevailed in the counsels of the time and to the sixty thousand French people living in Canada were guaranteed those precious possessions, liberty of worship and freedom of language. Thus was promise given of just treatment for this old community under their new flag.

Of the country itself in those early years what picture can I give you? One writer of the time politely described it as a place 'fit only to send exiles to as a punishment for their misspent lives.' So little value was attached to this newly found land that in 1758

and 1759 there had been a persistent clamour to force the Government, in the settlement of the treaty after the long war with France, to abandon Canada altogether and accept in its place the tiny island of Guadeloupe, in the Caribbean Sea. Guadeloupe is six hundred square miles in area. Canada, although it seemed then little less than a wilderness of forest and snow, has grown to cover 3,700,000 square miles. And yet political wiseacres of the day gave the sage counsel, 'Keep Guadeloupe; let Canada go.' It is an interesting fact that the best pamphlet pleading that Canada was worth more to the Empire than any sugar island was written by Benjamin Franklin.

Let me pass quickly by some milestones. In 1791 comes a turn in the road which is worth examining. After the peace of 1783 was signed, many thousands of people moved from the new republic into British North America. In their new home they were called

'Loyalists.' They settled by the sea, and north of Lake Ontario, and they endured with quiet heroism untold rigours in their new and arduous life. Although they had taken the Royalist side in your great struggle, these people did not believe in autocratic government. They believed in local self-government as strongly as John Adams himself. In fact the Englishman — the Anglo-Saxon — wherever he is or whatever he does, or whatever uniform he wears, has a stubborn, unconquerable love of personal freedom and liberty. So it was not long before these newly settled refugees demanded popular assemblies in Canada like those which they had left behind them and which their kin already enjoyed in the Maritime Provinces, just as insistently as their revolutionary friends had protested against the taxation of Grenville and North.

This demand was answered, and 1791 finds us in the beginning of a new era in

Canada. Upper Canada (now Ontario) was established as one province with a few thousand English-speaking settlers, and Lower Canada (now Quebec) was set up as another province on the banks of the St. Lawrence, with a larger population, chiefly French. Each had its Assembly, each its Governor, and each its nominated Second Chamber or Legislative Council. The grant of representative institutions to French and English alike was vastly important to the future of the Empire. It made clear, as students of our history have pointed out, that British liberty and British rights were not to be enjoyed by inhabitants of Great Britain and their descendants alone, but were to belong to all those who lived under the Union Jack and who were equal to the responsibilities involved. This French-speaking Assembly was a forecast of those British Parliaments which now exist in three continents, where you can hear not only French, but the Dutch

and Irish tongues, authorized along with English as official languages of debate.

One of the most picturesque scenes in our history, to my mind, is the opening of the first Legislature in Upper Canada, by Colonel Simcoe, the Lieutenant-Governor, when the majestic pageantry of Westminster was as faithfully reproduced as was possible in a building of logs in a clearing in the bush. The creation of popular assemblies in these two provinces of Canada was a great step. The farmer and the fur-trader now elected their representatives to voice their grievances and their aspirations. But 1791 does not represent the solution of a problem. It marks the beginning of a long and stormy controversy. Why? You have heard the old riddle, 'What happens when an irresistible force meets an immovable object?' Such a combination had existed in the thirteen Colonies before the Revolution. The irresistible force had been the popular assembly and the im-

movable object was the Governor, acting on orders from Westminster. As a matter of fact, in most essentials, the government of the Canadas in 1791 presented the same problem. A Governor was instructed to govern. A popular assembly was elected to legislate. When the Legislature — Assembly and Council acting together — passed a bill which the Governor thought was exceeding the proper limits, he could reserve it or refuse to assent to it. Or, and this with graver consequences, he could play off his nominated Council against the popular assembly and make it carry out his wishes by rejecting bills. The obvious results were the cutting-off of supplies by the Assembly.

The first possession of a nation, like that of an individual, is the control of its own affairs. The first half of the nineteenth century marks the struggle in the Canadas for this right. The world outside was little in-

terested. To the casual observer it seemed simply a political quarrel — the endless argument between the 'ins' and 'outs.' Sometimes there emerged the figure of a Governor applying his instructions from home with too little imagination; sometimes the stage was occupied by citizens with a zeal for self-government. But what was the real meaning of this endless controversy? It was actually a renewed and final debate on the question: 'Can a colony govern itself and still remain in the British Empire?' In 1776 you, in this country, had answered this question by a resounding 'No.' Was it possible for the people of British North America to say 'Yes'? Most of those concerned in the controversy probably did not know the importance of what they did. They were interested in practical questions, the control of the appointments of judges and surveyors, the voting of funds, the division of public lands, and other issues which need not con-

cern us now. But the principles involved meant more than they knew.

In 1837, as the girl queen Victoria ascended her throne, armed rebellions broke out in both Upper and Lower Canada. Sixty years before, thirteen British provinces had taken up arms against the Crown — now two more were following their example. Did this mean the end? The rebellions were easily crushed, but they were symptomatic of the spirit of discontent which remained. The Government at home decided that the whole situation should be fully explored and sent out as Governor of the Canadas the first Earl of Durham. Durham was an extraordinary figure. He was an aristocrat of the aristocrats, imperious, vain, aloof, impetuous. No one perhaps could be less democratic, as we often use the word nowadays — he brought out to Canada a great retinue, including a band of music. But not every democrat wears homespun and Durham was

not called 'Radical Jack' for nothing. He understood the essentials of democratic government. He also had three great qualities which so often have characterized Englishmen of his class: a vivid sense of public duty, keen political insight, and the courage of his convictions.

Lord Durham's 'Report on the Affairs of British North America' is probably the greatest state paper in British colonial history. If the Declaration of Independence is the foundation of your nation, Lord Durham's 'Report,' presented to Parliament in 1839, is the corner-stone of the modern British Empire. Why? Because it set down the political truth that in a colony the Crown, or its representative the Governor, must submit to the necessary consequences of representative institutions. Durham's 'Report,' gathering up the broken colonial aspirations and giving them the dignity of a great name, ultimately altered the whole

theory of colonial government, but this change did not take place overnight. The Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada were united in 1841, as Durham had recommended, but four Governors came and went before the principle of responsible self-government was fully accepted. In England the tradition of public service in great families is strong, and it is therefore not unnatural that it should have fallen to Durham's son-in-law, Lord Elgin, to establish finally the principle of responsible self-government in an episode which nearly cost him his life. In 1849, a measure to compensate those who had suffered losses in the Rebellion of 1837 was passed by the Canadian Parliament at Montreal. The bill had aroused furious opposition by those who claimed that it would involve payment to rebels. Violent scenes took place. The Parliament buildings were burned. Elgin was assaulted in the streets. He was determined to give the Royal Assent

to the bill because it had been passed by a majority in the Legislature. His own views he held to be of no account. The vice-regal signature on this bill is the symbol of colonial responsible self-government. History gives us a great roll of heroes who have helped to make nations. But I think that the Earl of Elgin, emerging from his carriage with a two-pound stone in his hand which had been hurled at him because he insisted on acting according to the will of the majority, presents a figure that might well take its place amongst the champions of democracy. All that has developed since this episode by which the Dominions have acquired the control of their affairs, in the external as well as in the domestic sphere, simply marks the extension of one principle. This principle is best represented by Lord Elgin's unfaltering assent to a measure which had been passed by the majority of the people's elected representatives.

The issue of self-government had been sternly contested, on the one hand by patriotic British North Americans and statesmanlike Englishmen who believed that the way to keep British North America in the British Empire was to give it the fullest possible control of its affairs, and on the other by men on both sides of the ocean — no less honest — who believed that self-government would mean the end of the Empire. Why? Because, as they reasoned, the Governor, if he must act in accordance with the popular majority, might be forced to act in a manner contrary to his instructions from home. He could not serve two masters. And this view had been held in British North America as well as in Great Britain. It is well to remember that this was not a quarrel between England and the Colonies. It was an argument between two schools of thought which were represented both in the mother country and overseas. In the controversies between

Great Britain and the Colonies this has always been the case. I need not remind you of the championship which your cause received, one hundred and fifty years ago, at the hands of Chatham and Edmund Burke, or of Englishmen like the old Norfolk squire Coke who boasted that he had drunk George Washington's health every night until the peace of 1783 had been signed.

The question of responsible government in my country has now been settled for seventy-five years and more. It took courage on the part of British North American statesmen and vision on the part of their colleagues in Britain to take the step; and, great as it was, it is a striking thing that this change was brought about by no revolution, nor by the adoption of a new constitution, nor by the abolition of any office nor by anything even so slight as a change of words in a public document — although, of course, the instructions given to the Governor-General

changed as the Colony grew and developed. Executive power still in fact remained in the Governor's hands. He could still, theoretically, refuse assent to bills or he could reserve them for the consideration of the Imperial Government if he saw fit. But a new principle had been established in men's minds. Something which is called *constitutional right* began to assert itself in 1849 in concrete form, and to place definite limits on *legal power*. This conflict between constitutional law and constitutional right occurs often in British political history. It has been two centuries since a British sovereign has refused assent to a bill passed by Parliament. The legal power to do so technically still remains, but the constitutional right of the democracy to make its own laws has existed for so long that the Royal assent is given as a matter of course. This is the characteristic British way of dealing with constitutional development.

I have talked about this growth of responsible government at considerable length. I make no apologies because it marks the most important step on the road to nationhood. It not only was important for British North America, but was of vital significance to the whole British Empire. On what became Canadian soil the experiment was worked out of harmonizing responsible colonial government with membership in a great Commonwealth. As self-government grew, attachment of the Colony to the larger unit was not weakened, but rather strengthened. It was found possible to reconcile nationality and imperial unity despite all the melancholy prophecies of those who thought it could not be done, and, as it became increasingly successful, other self-governing states grew up within the Empire like Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. The whole Empire was built anew round this corner-stone of national liberty and the very

word Empire came to have a new and different meaning.

I have illustrated our national developments from two important phases in the early history of British North America; the one commences with the establishment of British institutions and closes with the creation of representative government; the second, the natural outcome of the first, is the long process covering fifty years or more which led to the acceptance of the principle of responsible Cabinet government in the middle of the last century.

May I touch on the third and fourth great periods, which might be said to complete the story? One of these was ushered in by what we call Confederation — the great period during which British North America was unified, enlarged, and developed, and acquired its final stature. And the fourth period covers the last twelve years or so, commencing with the tragic romance of the

Great War, a period which placed the keystone in our national arch and gave Canada, in addition to national *stature*, national *status*.

Of Confederation I shall not say much. This year we are celebrating the Diamond Jubilee of this event. Much has been said about its meaning. Before 1867, what is now the Dominion of Canada was broken up into several scattered communities operating with no common government — the original Canada (now Ontario and Quebec, united before 1867), the three provinces by the sea, and, beyond more than two thousand miles of almost unbroken wilderness, the settlements on the west coast which are now British Columbia.

If self-government is essential to a nation, so is unity, but unity in British North America in the early sixties seemed a distant hope. The problem is shown by the confusion of the currency. In the Canadas the pound and the dollar were both legal and in active com-

petition. In Nova Scotia you could purchase commodities in Peruvian, Mexican, or Colombian dollars as you liked. Communications were sadly deficient. If you wished to travel between Toronto and Winnipeg (or what is now Winnipeg), or between Winnipeg and Vancouver, in winter, or between Montreal and St. John, you had to pass from British soil altogether. A letter from Toronto to Vancouver would probably go by way of South America. More serious than these physical difficulties were the administrative, political, and financial problems, which would make too long a story to be told here. A group of great men, however, as has so often happened in your history as well as in ours, appeared to perform a great and necessary task. If you should happen to visit Ottawa you will find on Parliament Hill statues bearing the names of Sir John Macdonald, George Brown, Sir George Cartier, and others who had the vision to see in their

minds' eye a single country under a single government extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. One of these Fathers of Confederation, as we call them, said in a prophetic speech (and in the style of his day), that he could see 'one great nationality bound like the shield of Achilles by the blue rim of ocean.' But it took men of vision to breathe the word 'nationality' at all in reference to these scattered people (in number, only four fifths of the present population of Massachusetts) who were taking possession of half a continent, larger in extent even than your own vast country. It required practical men, too, to work out the problem. In doing so they borrowed from you that great federal principle which had worked so well in this country, which leaves the States (Provinces we call them) free to look after their own domestic affairs, but which places the whole population for national purposes under the control of a central Government. But our

central Government itself was modelled as closely as could be done on the Government of Great Britain, for Canada is really a constitutional monarchy.

In the creation of the Dominion on a great national scale, Great Britain did all she could to help. British statesmen of the day fully shared the faith of the Fathers of Confederation in the future of the new Dominion. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Carnarvon, who introduced into the House of Lords the measure which created modern Canada, expressed himself in terms of wise British statesmanship when he said:

> We are laying the foundation of a great State — perhaps one which at a future day may even overshadow this country. But, come what may, we shall rejoice that we have shown neither indifference to their wishes, nor jealousy of their aspirations, but that we honestly and sincerely to the utmost of our power and knowledge, fostered their growth, recognizing in it the conditions of our own greatness. We are in this measure setting the

crown to the free institutions which more than a quarter of a century ago we gave them, and therein we remove, as I firmly believe, all possibilities of future jealousy or misunderstanding.

On July 1st, 1867, by a royal proclamation the modern Canada came into being with its four original Provinces — Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. The original name suggested by colonial statesmen was the 'Kingdom of Canada,' but it was thought that the term might lead to misunderstandings, and the picturesque story is that one of the Fathers of Confederation came to the council table one morning and made his contribution to the search for a name from a passage in the Bible: 'He shall have dominion from sea to sea and from the river unto the ends of the earth.' But it was only in men's vision that Canada reached from sea to sea until this result was achieved after six years of effort, during which British Columbia joined the Union and the Province

of Prince Edward Island, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, also entered it. During this period too, that vast area known as the North-West Territories was acquired from the ancient Hudson's Bay Company, which had been founded two centuries before by Prince Rupert of England. Those who have a romantic mind will like to think of this corporation, once called the 'Company of Gentlemen Adventurers Trading into Hudson's Bay,' despite its ancient lineage still pursuing its course as a great modern company in the Canadian West.

A nation has two forms of growth — its spiritual side must develop and expand, and it must have physical growth as well. Both sides are necessary. During the years that followed Confederation, the great development of Canada took place. As various communities came into the new Dominion, they had to be bound together by the steel bands of railways. One line, now part of the great

national system, linked the Maritime Provinces with Central Canada. British Columbia was promised a railway to unite it with the East, and thus came about the fine engineering adventure of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the first single railway to cross the continent of North America from ocean to ocean. Its promoters undertook to construct it in ten years. The last spike was driven in less than six years from its commencement. One can have some idea of the difficulties which the engineers overcame when one realizes that in some places on the line there are three layers of rails one beneath the other, the first two having been sucked down by the muskeg over which the line passed. Railway-building has gone on in Canada until, because of our peculiar need of communication, there are now more miles of line to each inhabitant than in any country in the world.

Since Confederation hundreds of thou-

sands of people, most of them tracing their descent from the parent stock of Great Britain, have taken up their homes in the Dominion, and the great expanse of bare prairie has seen prosperous towns and cities grow up where a few years before only the scarlet coat of the mounted policeman and the Hudson's Bay Company's factor had represented civilization. The great North-West, which people thought, in the middle of the nineteenth century, was a hopeless waste, was found to be capable of producing wheat. Scientists bred types of grain that could ripen quickly and escape frost, and the frontier of cultivation was pushed steadily northwards until now wheat is grown within four hundred miles of the Arctic Circle. Sixty years ago all Canada produced perhaps about fifteen million bushels. In the area now covered by the three Prairie Provinces as many as four hundred and fifty millions of bushels have been grown in a single year.

To-day, of all the nations, we annually make to the world the greatest contribution of wheat and the flour made from it. There is genuine romance in the movement, in a few generations, from a single furrow to the first place in the grain markets of the world. In other spheres, too, the advance has been striking. When the Dominion was first founded, there was little or no mining in Canada. Now there is a vast area lying to the north which is revealing from year to year mineral treasure of which we never dreamed. The rivers, which in early years were the only path of the explorer and the settler, who propelled their canoes on the broad waters, and which later gave nourishment to the new fields of grain, are now a source of new life in the power which can be generated from their waters.

But let me pass to the fourth and final phase of this national growth. Canada acquired a personality in the nineteenth cen-

tury and physical growth came with it. Something else was needed to create direct touch with the world at large, and this came with the Great War. What was the effect on Canada of this war which made nations and destroyed empires? A country with less than nine millions of people cannot engage in four and a half years of conflict and send four hundred thousand men to serve in France with the King's colours, of whom sixty thousand gave their lives, without gaining a more vivid consciousness of what lies beyond its shores.

With the War, Canada swung into the full current of the world's life and established relations with neighbours near and far. It was, therefore, appropriate when the great peace was signed at Versailles, in 1919, that Canada, along with the other Dominions which had fought by its side, should have the right to place its own signature on the document. When the League of Nations was

created, it was fitting that these units, which had entered the War as nations, should enter as nations, too, that society of peoples that came into being to make war more remote. (A further step was taken when Canada this year became a member of the executive body of the League — the Council — and this with the blessing of the representatives of Great Britain.)

And so a process has steadily gone on in which a new and revitalized Empire — a third British Empire, also called, and appropriately, the British Commonwealth of Nations — has emerged. If the War destroyed some political structures, it transformed and created anew that of which Canada is an integral part, giving it greater unity and strength because it rests on the full development of its component parts. That is why the Dominions, if they wish, can establish diplomatic relations with foreign countries, why, for instance, Canada has set up

its Legation in the Capital of your country, and why you have reciprocated. (And here let me thank Milton Academy for sending to Canada, as the first foreign Minister to be received by the Dominion, a most distinguished graduate in the person of Mr. William Phillips.)

I think it was Lord Salisbury who said, 'The looser the tie, the closer the bond.' The paradox is true. The touchstone of the British Empire is liberty. And that is why the British Empire is dynamic and not static, why the Great War, instead of destroying its fabric as it did in the case of four historic Empires, left ours stronger than ever before. But you may ask: What are the bonds between the Dominions and the mother country? First of all, there is the great symbol of unity embodied in the Crown. The King of England is also the King of Canada, of Australia, of New Zealand, and of the other Dominions. Every executive act of these great

States is done in his name. Every member of Parliament takes the oath of allegiance to His Majesty. Every commission is issued and all government property is held in the name of the King. The Sovereign who occupies the throne not only represents the spiritual unity of the Empire, but also the national life of each Dominion in it. For the Crown, as every one knows, is not only a jewelled object to be seen behind great bars in the Tower of London. It is much more. When I see on one of the mail waggons in Canada the Royal Crown, with the letters 'G.R.' on each side of it, it never fails to stir my imagination. It suggests so many things. It conjures up an unbroken stretch of a thousand years and more of history. It suggests the coherence of a great Commonwealth, covering a quarter of the area of the globe, and containing one fourth of its people. And it also represents the nationality of Canada and of each country within the Empire, of

which the monarch who wears the Crown is the national sovereign.

But there is something else that unites our Commonwealth. There is a common citizenship. An Englishman or a Scotsman coming to Canada requires no naturalization. After a short residence he becomes a citizen automatically, with all the privileges of citizenship. On the other hand, a Canadian or Australian going to England enjoys the same rights as the other British subjects who were born in that country. He can vote, can even stand for election to Parliament.

Then there are those great indefinable bonds of common traditions and common institutions which we share with the people of Great Britain, not to speak of the countless ties of family and race which mean so much in human affairs. And above all there is that great community of feeling and interest which gives to the British peoples a unity enduring and indivisible.

Our nationality and our orientation are well expressed by the coat of arms which we have chosen. The ancient stock from which Canadians have sprung is represented in the quarterings by the lions of England, the lilies of France, the lion of Scotland, and the Irish harp. The new nationality made up of these elements is marked by the three maple leaves which have become the special emblem of Canada. The shield is supported by those traditional heraldic beasts, the lion and the unicorn, which can be said to stand for the British institutions which all Canadians inherit. Surmounting the whole is the British Crown, the mystical symbol of the Empire's unity and of the sovereignty to which Canada owes allegiance.

I have tried to tell you something of the Dominion's story. Burke once said that a statesman is required to have 'a disposition to preserve and an ability to improve taken together.' Somehow it seems to me that in

Canada we have, unconsciously, perhaps, tried to hold such a balance. We have tried both to improve and preserve. We are a mixture of new and old. We have a new nationality with an ancient allegiance. It is a strange, illogical structure, this British Empire of 1927 in which our young nation is a loyal partner. Lawyers sometimes find it difficult to understand. It is not easy to pigeonhole. Textbooks have to be rewritten to describe it. But it has been planted foursquare on the solid stones of the liberties of young independent-minded nations, and if the sceptic says, How can it be? how can this liberty and unity be joined together? one might well reply in the words with which an Englishman once answered a sceptic, by quoting the line from Goethe which can be translated: 'Him I love who attempts the impossible.' One might add that 'he who attempts the impossible with faith not seldom achieves it.'

Through the years, therefore, the bonds of affection which unite us to our sisters in the British Commonwealth have grown stronger as our sense of nationality has deepened. At the same time there has been strengthened the concord which exists between the Dominion and its great neighbour to the south. On an international line — not a frontier — our two separate civilizations will ever meet in amity. Our future is great with promise. Canada, like your country, has passed through its period of trial and stress. No human being or human institution can accomplish much without the lessons of endurance and steadfastness. There is a famous passage in the works of the poet whose name this school bears which speaks of the future of the state in words which have the grandeur of organ music. I like to think that your northern neighbour has shared the poet's prophecy with you, and all those who have kept true to their heritage, and that

we, in Milton's words, can 'outlive those pangs and wax young again, entering the glorious ways of truth and prosperous virtue, destined to become great and honourable in these latter ages.'

O8-CSL-590